Ham-Policy Digest   Thu, 6 May 93   Volume 93 : Issue 130

Today's Topics:
                        Advice to no-code debaters
                            Autopatch (3 msgs)
              Cellular capable scanners...Buy'em While you can!
               MARS operators and coded messages (was Re: MARS)
                          sick of it all (2 msgs)
                        There is no problem anyway

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 5 May 93 17:48:11 GMT
From: gossip.pyramid.com!pyramid!infmx!woof!randall@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: Advice to no-code debaters
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Here is some advice to those who continue to participate in the
no-code debate:

1) Please use rec.radio.amateur.policy, not .misc.   The .policy
group was created specifically because the no-code debate
was cluttering the old rec.ham-radio group too much.

2) You have no new arguments. The no-code debate has been
flaming on for years. All arguments for or against have
been made many times. There are no new arguments, twists,
or angles. Give up. By continuing the debate, you will
just get flamed.

3) Some people feel religious about CW. They consider the
no-code license to be a sign of the decline of western
civilization. You will never convince them otherwise.

4) Some people feel religious about anti-CW. They think
CW stops all progress of civilization. You will never convince
them otherwise.

5) If you really oppose the no-code ticket, then the best
thing to do is to positively convice no-code hams to learn
code and upgrade. Thousands of no-code hams have done so.
There are many reasons to use CW, and the best thing you can
do is to show other hams what they are.

6) If you don't like CW, then don't use it. Let other hams
who like it use it, and you can use other modes.

73 DE KK6MY

--

=-=
Randall Rhea   Informix Software, Inc.
Project Manager, MIS Sales/Marketing Systems   uunet!pyramid!infmx!randall

----

Date: 6 May 1993 01:17:28 GMT
From: saimiri.primate.wisc.edu!sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!bobw@ames.arpa
Subject: Autopatch
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

gary@ke4zv.uucp (Gary Coffman) writes:
>
> Content limits on amateur radio: Remarks of a techinical or personal
> nature too unimportant to require access to the public switched network.
>
  I see the FCC puts this limit on the contents of amateur comunication
  when communicating with a station in another country. However, I don't
  see where the FCC applies this rule to communication inside the U.S.
  I suppose the fast food joint could be in another country....

 Bob Witte / HP Colo Springs / bobw@col.hp.com   / KB0CY

Date: 6 May 1993 01:11:56 GMT
From: elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!bobw@ames.arpa
Subject: Autopatch
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

raven@nraven.wariat.org (Dan Roberts) writes:
> Hypothetical situation:
>
> I stop at a fast-food restaurant on my way to a friend's house. I decide that
> I'll be a nice guy and see if he'd like me to bring something for him, so I
> call him on the autopatch, ask him what he wants and how much it costs, etc..
>
> Would that be illegal due to the "not for business use" clause in the rule
> book?
>
  Oh, good, we get to argue the "business use" thing again.
  Honorable people will disagree on this issue, but in my book
  your description of the event implies that there is a real
  business transaction taking place here since the cost of the
  food is discussed.

  If it was just an inquiry of "do you want some food?", I personally
  wouldn't call it business use.

 Bob Witte / HP Colo Springs / bobw@col.hp.com   / KB0CY

Date: 6 May 93 13:54:43 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!
zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!uwm.edu!msuinfo!netnews.upenn.edu!prijat!
triangle.cs.uofs.edu!bill@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Autopatch
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <VBc43B1w165w@dreaml.wariat.org>, jga@dreaml.wariat.org (Jon Anhold)
writes:
|> raven@nraven.wariat.org (Dan Roberts) writes:
|>
|> | Would that be illegal due to the "not for business use" clause in the rule
|> | book?
|>
|> While many people argue that that is legal, I personally wouldn't do it.
|> And seeing as you are local to me, if you did it on one of LEARA's
|> repeaters, you MIGHT get a phone call from one of the trustee's asking you
|> not to do it. Maybe. I'm not a trustee, but.. :)
|>

I'm on my way over to K2OED's house to help him put up that new TH6DXX he
just got. As I drive down the street I see MacDonalds up ahead and decide
I am about ready for some lunch before I start climbing that tower. Of
course, all the way over I have been having a running conversation with
Steve, so when my turn comes I say, "Hey Steve, want a burger or some
fries??" And you think that is a violation of Part 97?? Sure glad your
not a Judge.

I wish the FCC would hurry up with the new rules regarding legitimate
communications that we kept hearing about a few months ago.

bill   KB3YV

--
Bill Gunshannon | "There are no evil thoughts, Mr. Reardon" Francisco
bill@cs.uofs.edu | said softly, "except one; the refusal to think."
University of Scranton |
Scranton, Pennsylvania | #include <std.disclaimer.h>

Date: Thu, 06 May 93 04:03:18 CDT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!menudo.uh.edu!jpunix!
unkaphaed!amanda!robert@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Cellular capable scanners...Buy'em While you can!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

sdkuo@argo.acs.oakland.edu (Steve Kuo) writes:

> There are some cellular phone that have undocumented receive features.
> You enter a special code, and you scan scroll thru (listening) to all
> voice channels.
>
> I've seen this once (a CellularOne employee showed this to me).
>
> --
> Steve Kuo, N8OPH, sdkuo@oakland.edu

The feature that you mentioned is called the "tech mode."

Date: Wed, 5 May 1993 20:52:20 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!
zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!cs.utexas.edu!utnut!torn!nott!bnrgate!bnr.co.uk!uknet!
brunel!mt92mmj@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: MARS operators and coded messages (was Re: MARS)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Jeff Miller wrote:
: In article <1rp18t$19p@network.ucsd.edu> brian@ucsd.edu (Brian Kantor) writes:

:   jerryb@jerber.sandiego.sgi.com (Jerry Bransford) writes:
:   >Right on!! To those who CAN'T STAND not knowing all the CAP/MARS, etc
:   >frequencies, CTCSS tones, etc. etc. GET A LIFE!!

:   Oh, those frequencies aren't secret - they're in just about every
:   scanner book and magazine, so it's not like it's hard to find them.

:   What I think is hilarious is that the people in those services think
:   their frequencies ARE secret. Perhaps that's part of the thrill.

    Yes, I worked an equivalent type of thing over here in Britain as
    a cadet, and it's amazing how others assumed that just because they
    were sitting in front of an MOD set that they had secure tx.

[Deleted some stuff]
: Jeff
: --
: Jeff Miller, NH6ZW/N8, AFA1HE (ex WD6CQV, AFA8JM, AFA1DO)
: AFIT School of Engineering, Wright-Patterson AFB, OH
: Welcome to Ohio: Our state flower is the orange highway construction barrel.
: Help eliminate FOD in our lifetime.

--
Marcus Jones   mt92mmj@brunel.ac.uk
Dept. Materials Technology, Brunel University, Uxbridge, Middx, GB, UB8 3PH.
Disclaimer My views are my own invention.

Date: 6 May 93 06:52:06
From: idacrd.ccr-p.ida.org!idacrd!n4hy@uunet.uu.net
Subject: sick of it all
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

>hlester@as.arizona.edu (Howard Lester) writes:
>
>I think it's been stated pretty clearly what's "wanted". Make the
>licensing requirements relevant and related to the privileges granted.
>Granting access to portions of the phone bands to someone because they can
>copy 20 WPM instead of 13 WPM or 13 WPM instead of 5 WPM seems a bit
>bizarre. In addition I think most have "wanted" the written exams
>substantially beefed up.

The idea is so that you will whine and complain just like you are doing and

then finally admit that you have to upgrade your skills if you want the
priveleges. That is why they call it INCENTIVE licensing. I support no-code.
I was one of the instigators in getting TAPR and AMSAT to make their first
public support statements (I was on their BOD's) but this has gone far enough
and gone on long enough. We have a structure that is doing EXACTLY what we
wanted and that is bringing in droves of hams. Many of them are upgrading
and we are getting skilled technical people who would never have bothered
before as well. I have to admit it is time to modify my kill file, something
I adhor doing.

BMc
--

Robert W. McGwier | n4hy@ccr-p.ida.org
Center for Communications Research | Interests: amateur radio, astronomy,golf
Princeton, N.J. 08520 | Asst Scoutmaster Troop 5700, Hightstown

----

Date: Thu, 6 May 1993 19:06:56 GMT
From: pa.dec.com!nntpd2.cxo.dec.com!nuts2u.enet.dec.com!little@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: sick of it all
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

n4hy@growler.ccr-p.ida.org (Bob McGwier) writes:

>The idea is so that you will whine and complain just like you are doing and
>then finally admit that you have to upgrade your skills if you want the

How very convenient to label advocating change as whining. It presupposes
that the advocates have no basis in fact for their for their argument.
Call it what you like, but do you call it whining because you have no
better argument?

Some may seek change because they don't want to put in the effort. I put
in the effort and I still want to see the change as I want prospective hams
to put the effort into something that serves the purpose of the amateur
service. How can that be whining? I see extra's posting in favor of
change. I guess they're whining too.

Also, this denigrating of the US population is rather humorous.
Practically every other country had no-code licenses before the US and I
suspect that they'll have reduced or eliminated code requirements long
before the US too. Must be they have louder whiners. But I quess that
wouldn't explain why they have written exams that don't have questions
like:

What is the purpose of a climbing belt?

A) To hold up your pants
B)...

Why bother with a written exam if you aren't going test anything other than
test taking skills? So you're right, if you aren't willing to make the
written exams difficult enough to require some studying, eliminate them
too. They're just an administrative hassle serving no purpose. (Although
at least the written exams are more relevent to the privileges granted.)

It's funny that the EEOC and courts went out of their way to eliminate
capricious and irrelevent testing for the purposes of employment, yet the
FCC apparently feels that those are valuable attributes for its testing
efforts. Strange too that the FCC move to this absurd "incentive"
licensing structure occured about the same time employment testing and
selection became really popular. The EEOC saw the absurdity of it, but I
guess they never let the FCC know about it.

If you want incentive licensing, then incite amateurs to learn something
that serves the puposes of the amateur service and not the whims of the
intransigent few.

73,
Todd
N9MWB

PS Thanks for moving this to .policy where it belongs. Also, you misquoted.
    I wrote the paragraph you included in your post, not Howard Lester.

Date: Thu, 6 May 1993 14:18:47 GMT
From: usc!sdd.hp.com!apollo.hp.com!hpwin052!hpqmoea!dstock@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: There is no problem anyway
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

   Morse code is an effective method of communicating, it may or may not
be the best depending on your opinion, but it is still effective.

   It has a convenient set of internationally understood abbreviations
covering many aspects of operating radio links.

   Should changeing conditions wreck an SSB contact (for example), it
may be possible to change to Morse in order to complete the contact, or
just to arrange a change of frequency.

   There is a sufficiently large population, spread around the world,
using Morse, to make it worth learning in order to not lock yourself out

of the chance of some desirable contacts. This has caused serious SWLs to learn it.

   Folklore says that the denizens of the HF CW sections are more welcoming, friendly or gentlemenly than those to be found on SSB. Well, I've certainly seen a lot of both of the possible sorts of exceptions to that rather sweeping generalisation, I've had some of my most enjoyable contacts on phone, and have met some very crabby CW operators, but I must say that my experience makes me believe that there is such a trend, overall.

   There is a real possibility that at some future World Administrative Radio Conference, the legislators may see no further need for a Morse requirement for access to the HF amateur bands as the other users are phasing out their use of Morse. After this it is likely that various countries may start to drop their Morse requirements.

   I do not see this as a precursor to the end of the world, or merely the end of amateur radio as we know it, I expect the effect to be slight. Many people who are not keen on Morse did it anyway, just to get on HF, and have since never used it at all. They won't be affected. Many people are actively keen on Morse as a satisfying mode. They'll learn it anyway. The only group affected are those who have a mental block on Morse, or who don't see HF as being worth all the effort. From my own observations in a country that has had "no-coders" allowed everything except HF for the past few decades, I believe that there would be no effect of a floodgate opening, the numbers would be moderate once those who would have done the morse test anyway are taken into account. I have seen no evidence that the proportion of these people who are incompetent or, for that matter, of evil intent, is any larger than in any other population. (including the HF population)

   CW as a mode will have to stand on its own two feet, and be appreciated as an effective, entertaining, and welcoming mode, to attract voluntary recruits.

        I believe it can.

   CW operators will have to put effort into displaying the attractions of the mode, and into helping those who choose to try it to become proficient.

        I have already seen them doing this.

I do not see any problem worth worrying about, but there are
people on both sides of the argument getting so heated about it that I
feel that they must not be enjoying life much.

     Cheers
          David   GM4ZNX

Date: Wed, 5 May 93 22:20:56 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!
nntp.Stanford.EDU!umunhum!paulf@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <930503.231125.2N3.rusnews.w165w@mooch.sbs.com>,
<10834@blue.cis.pitt.edu>, <1s9bgj$dmh@mickey.cc.utexas.edu>f
Subject : Re: no-code defense

In article <1s9bgj$dmh@mickey.cc.utexas.edu> davros@mickey.cc.utexas.edu (Buddy
Brannan) writes:
>We've hashed this crap out for how long now? Let it rest, hey? Look. No code
>is here, like it or not.

Agreed; however, the issue now is whether the CW requirement should be
dropped alltogether (eg, for HF privileges). These are two entirely separate
issues; one is moot, one is not.

--
-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "Just name a hero, and I'll prove he's a bum."
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Col. Gregory "Pappy" Boyington, USMC (ret)

Date: Thu, 06 May 1993 02:39:42 GMT
From: elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!sdd.hp.com!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!moe.ksu.ksu.edu!
crcnis1.unl.edu!news.unomaha.edu!nevada.edu!jimi!physics.unr.edu!nimbus!
mswmod@decwrl.dec.com
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <C6Gu9B.K9L@murdoch.acc.Virginia.EDU>,
<1993May3.231537.11520@nntpd2.cxo.dec.com>, <C6IGv0.EDr@cbnewsm.cb.att.com>du
Subject : Re: sick of it all

How much would you like to bet that if the written part of the
test was done like some of the other countries, people would
cry about the tests being too hard.

The real issue isn't cw. It's having to do something that isn't
liked in order to earn a license. Anything short of no license
would anger some.

The whole country seems to think that someone else is to blame for
everything and that the government should see to it that we never
have to do without anything.

I'm afraid that any effort to impliment any system that would require
work, learning, studying etc would be shouted down by the noisy few.

Can't we look around and see that Hams, for the most part, are
a nice bunch, get along well and have fun? Either in spite of or
because of CW.

This should be a hobby. It should be fun. Why do some use it as a
source for argument? This is the same things that can be heard on
SSB. Anyone wonder why I only use CW?

So lighten up, enjoy life and radio. 100 years from now, we won't
know the difference anyway.

Listen for me from my car on 40, 30 and 20.

"Ron" KU7Y/M
Sun Valley, NV

Date: 6 May 1993 00:36:55 GMT
From: elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!swrinde!emory!gatech!howland.reston.ans.net!
zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!destroyer!vela.acs.oakland.edu!
argo.acs.oakland.edu!SDKUO@decwrl.dec.com
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Apr30.045836.18412@nntpd2.cxo.dec.com>,
<1993Apr30.110420.15482@VFL.Paramax.COM>,
<1993May5.004411.27545@alsys.com>,<1s91abINNnc9@topaz.bds.com>.ed
Reply-To : sdkuo@argo.acs.oakland.edu
Subject : Re: Cellular capable scanners...Buy'em While you can!

>> Seems to me that under this definition, cellular telephones are scanners,
>
>Now Gary, there you make the mistake. You see, cellular telephones aren't
>radio's, they're telephones. That's what started this whole foolishness

There are some cellular phone that have undocumented receive features.

You enter a special code, and you scan scroll thru (listening) to all
voice channels.

I've seen this once (a CellularOne employee showed this to me).

--
Steve Kuo, N8OPH, sdkuo@oakland.edu

Date: Wed, 5 May 1993 18:56:30 GMT
From: mvb.saic.com!unogate!news.service.uci.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!
wa4mei!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <raven.02pd@nraven.wariat.org>, <1993May4.215247.5186@VFL.Paramax.COM>,
<raven.02pj@nraven.wariat.org>ke
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)
Subject : Re: Autopatch

In article <raven.02pj@nraven.wariat.org> raven@nraven.wariat.org (Dan Roberts)
writes:
>rossi@VFL.Paramax.COM (Pete Rossi) writes:
>
>>Why not just call him from the fast-food place? Most have pay phones
>>don't they?
>
>SOME do.. one in particular has one that has been broken for 2 years now and I
>don't think anyone is going to fix it.. =)   Okay, let's say I'm in the drive
>thru line then, and I can't get to a pay phone..
>
>Just answer the question.. I'm not going to use an autopatch unless I NEED to..

Content limits on amateur radio: Remarks of a techinical or personal
nature too unimportant to require access to the public switched network.

If your need to make the call is strong enough that you'd drop a dime,
then you drop the dime, not use amateur radio. If it's so unimportant
that you wouldn't use a phone if it were sitting next to you, then you can
use amateur radio.

Gary
--
Gary Coffman KE4ZV | You make it, | gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems | we break it. | uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way | Guaranteed! | emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244 | |

In article <12070@prijat.cs.uofs.edu> bill@triangle.cs.uofs.edu (Bill Gunshannon)
writes:
>
>I'm on my way over to K2OED's house to help him put up that new TH6DXX he
>just got. As I drive down the street I see MacDonalds up ahead and decide
>I am about ready for some lunch before I start climbing that tower. Of
>course, all the way over I have been having a running conversation with
>Steve, so when my turn comes I say, "Hey Steve, want a burger or some
>fries??" And you think that is a violation of Part 97?? Sure glad your
>not a Judge.
>
>I wish the FCC would hurry up with the new rules regarding legitimate
>communications that we kept hearing about a few months ago.

Along this same line........ This just happened to me last weekend.

  I was driving to the local hardware store Saturday afternoon for something
  I needed for a home project. On the way, a friend called me on 2 meters on
  a simplex channel we use/monitor. He was at work in his store at the time.
  We chat for a few seconds. He tells me how he it trying to fix one of his
  refrigeration units in his store - and in casual conversation mentions that
  he needs an odd size allen wrench that he does not have. I say "Hey, I am
  just about to park and go into the XYZ hardware store myself... I will see
  if they have what you are looking for." He answers "Great! If they do,
  pick one up for me."

  It turns out they had what he needed and when I got back in the car I told
  him I would drop it off at his store since I would be passing right by it
  on my way home. We continued chatting about other stuff......

Now, could this be considered business use? It was not intentional or
planned in any way. We were just having an "idle conversation" chatting
about this thing he was trying to fix. I just happened to be in the right
place at the right time to be able to help him out... So I did.

What does your FCC judge say about that one?

```
==================================================================
Pete Rossi - WA3NNA                      rossi@VFL.Paramax.COM

Paramax Systems Corporation - a Unisys Company
Valley Forge Engineering Center - Paoli, Pennsylvania
==================================================================
```

Date: 6 May 93 20:35:35 GMT
From: telesoft!garym@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993May4.215247.5186@VFL.Paramax.COM>, <raven.02pj@nraven.wariat.org>,
<1993May5.185630.20695@ke4zv.uucp>
Subject : Re: Autopatch

In <1993May5.185630.20695@ke4zv.uucp> gary@ke4zv.uucp (Gary Coffman) writes:
>In article <raven.02pj@nraven.wariat.org> raven@nraven.wariat.org (Dan Roberts)
writes:
>>>Why not just call him from the fast-food place? Most have pay phones
>>>don't they?

>Content limits on amateur radio: Remarks of a techinical or personal
>nature too unimportant to require access to the public switched network.

Come on people, read the regulations, 97.117, the rule Gary paraphrased
above, only applies to transmissions to a different country, not within the
U.S. I'm tired of hearing this same misinformation over and over again.

--GaryM

Date: 5 May 1993 16:27:47 -0500
From: overload.lbl.gov!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!magnus.acs.ohio-state.edu!
zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!usc!cs.utexas.edu!geraldo.cc.utexas.edu!
mickey.cc.utexas.edu!not-for-mail@@dog.ee.lbl.gov
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <C6Fp4o.F2L@news.Hawaii.Edu>,
<930503.231125.2N3.rusnews.w165w@mooch.sbs.com>, <10834@blue.cis.pitt.edu>aphod.mp
Subject : Re: no-code defense

Regarding this "Are you in favor of the NoCode license?":

I'm Clyde Anderson Brannan, III (Clyde to computers,lawyers, and the like;
Buddy to the world), and my call is KB5ELV. I'm an Extra (like it really mat-

ters). I wanna know: Who really cares? We're not getting anything solved here.
We've hashed this crap out for how long now? Let it rest, hey? Look. No code
is here, like it or not. (I used to not; I've seen no ill effects, so it
seems to be a good thing (TM).) C'mon. We'll have lids (and kids and space
cadets?) for the next rest of eternity; we've had them before No Code too.
So what? Give it up, guys!
--
Buddy Brannan, KB5ELV, Riff-Raff #4
The World's Youngest Old Fart :-)
Internet: davros@ccwf.cc.utexas.edu
"... Every inch of me that isn't a carnivore is 100% vegetarian."--Elf-Kin

----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #130
****